CH 1007 (3)

(1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.No.3540 OF 2003.

PETITIONER : Smt. Kamlesh Kumari Rai, W/o Shri Maniklal Rai, Aged about 43 years, R/o Village Kumhari, Tahsil Marwahi, District Bilaspur, (C.G.).

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Mahila Bal Vikas Vibhag, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, (C.G.).

2. Janpad Panchayat, Marwahi, Through: The Chief Executive Officer, Marwahi, District Bilaspur, (C.G.).

3. Project Officer, Mahila Bal Vikas Vibhag, Marwahi, District Bilaspur, (C.G.).

4. Gram Panchayat, Gullidand, Through: The Secretary, Tahsil Marwahi, District Bilaspur, (C.G.).

P. R. No. 3341/03
Presented by Shri Jyoti Pandey
dated 29.12.03

RECEIVED COPY
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(35)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

W.P. No. 3540/03

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	6.2.2004 **Petitioner by Shri Rahul Birtharya, Advocate.** **State by Shri Praveen Das, Panel lawyer.** **The petitioner has preferred this writ petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India challenging the order dt. 3.10.2003 passed by the Respondent No.2 whereby the appointment of the petitioner on the post of Anganbadi Worker has been cancelled without giving any opportunity of hearing. Therefore, the action of the Respondent No.2 is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.** **Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on earlier occasion the petitioner was terminated on 7.12.1993 against which she had moved to the Labour Court and the Labour Court had quashed that termination order and the petitioner joined the services. Thereafter again the petitioner has now been terminated; therefore the petitioner has filed this petition against the order of termination dt. 3.10.2003.** **The petitioner has got equally efficacious remedy available, as on the earlier occasion she had approached the Labour Court and got relief, therefore she should have approached the Labour Court. More over learned counsel for the State submits that the order passed by the Respondent No.2 is appelable before the Collector.** **In view of the above, this petition is dismissed on the ground that alternative and equally efficacious remedy is available to the petitioner.** **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

[पीछे देखिये

Tiwari

10.02